

Proposal Reviews

#260: Yuba Goldfields Fish Barrier Replacement Project

Yuba County Water Agency

Final Selection Panel Review

Initial Selection Panel Review

Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review

Sacramento Regional Review

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Final Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Final Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 260

Applicant Organization: Yuba County Water Agency

Proposal Title: Yuba Goldfields Fish Barrier Replacement Project

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

Fund	
As Is	-
In Part	-
With Conditions	X
Consider as Directed Action	-
Not Recommended	-

Amount: **\$68260**

Conditions, if any, of approval (if there are no conditions, please put "None"):

Fund 50% of project costs, so long as the applicant is not implementing this project pursuant to a State Water Resources Control Board order or decision.

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

One supportive comment was received during the comment period.

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 260

Applicant Organization: Yuba County Water Agency

Proposal Title: Yuba Goldfields Fish Barrier Replacement Project

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

Explanation of Recommendation Categories: Fund

- **As Is** (a proposal recommended for funding as proposed)
- **In Part** (a proposal for which partial funding is recommended for selected project phases or components)
- **With Conditions** (a proposal for which funds are recommended if the applicant contractually agrees to meet the specified conditions)

Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan (a proposal addressing a high priority action that requires some revision followed by additional review prior to being recommended for funding)

Not Recommended (a proposal not currently recommended for funding-after revision may be considered in the future)

Note on "Amount":

For proposals recommended as Fund As Is, Fund In Part or Fund With Conditions, the dollar amount is the amount recommended by the Selection Panel.

For proposals recommended as Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan, the dollar amount is the amount requested by the applicant(s).

Fund	
As Is	-
In Part	-
With Conditions	X
Consider as Directed Action	-
Not Recommended	-

Amount: **\$68,260**

Conditions, if any, of approval (if there are no conditions, please put "None"):

Fund 50% of project costs, so long as the applicant is not implementing this project pursuant to a State Water Resources Control Board order or decision.

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

This proposal generally received high marks for adequately addressing an important fish passage issue on the Yuba River. The selection panel recommends that this action be funded if a fifty percent cost share could be provided from non-State and federal agency sources, and so long as the applicant is not implementing this project pursuant to a State Water Resources Control Board order or decision.

Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review

Proposal Number: 260

Applicant Organization: Yuba County Water Agency

Proposal Title: Yuba Goldfields Fish Barrier Replacement Project

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Superior: outstanding in all respects;

Above Average: Quality proposal, medium or high regional value, and no significant administrative concerns;

Adequate: No serious deficiencies, no significant regional impediments, and no significant administrative concerns;

Not Recommended: Serious deficiencies, significant regional impediments or significant administrative concerns.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Superior	The proposal provides excellent background and rationale for the proposed project. The proposed project has already passed through substantial technical review and has very broad local and technical support. It appears to be cost effective and is almost certain to provide substantial benefits to adults (and possibly juveniles) of most priority salmonid species. The issue of whether CALFED should fund a project required by the SWRCB needs further discussion.
-Above average	
X Adequate	
-Not recommended	

1. **Location in terms of potential impact on fishery.** Is the project located where it will significantly benefit the fishery? Do current fish passage barriers or water diversions there harm large numbers of fish? What species of anadromous fish are present? Is the project located where these species are in their most vulnerable life stages? Will it benefit other species of fish or the waterway's community and ecosystem? Does it restore and protect natural habitats or habitat values? Will its benefits be long-term, or short-lived? Is its biological effectiveness clearly demonstrable?

The project is to replace a temporary fish barrier on the outlet canal between Yuba Goldfields and the lower Yuba River with a more permanent leaky-dike barrier. The barrier prevents adult upmigrating fall, late fall, and spring-run chinook salmon and steelhead from migrating into and becoming trapped in the Goldfields, which has inadequate habitat and food, extensive predator habitat, and elevated water temperatures. The present temporary rock barrier is the latest in a series of barriers, all of which have failed in high flow events. The proposed barrier would be permanent and the biological benefits of preventing adult

salmonids from straying into suboptimal habitat are clear. The proposed leaky dike barrier will also function to retain the value of emergent freshwater wetlands and riparian habitat located within the Goldfields.

2. **Diversions taking a greater proportion of flow.** If the project is a fish screen, is the size of the diversion to be screened a significant proportion of the waterway's discharge?

Not applicable

3. **Implementability** (minimal legal, regulatory or technical obstacles): Does the project use proven and existing technology, or unproven and experimental technology? Can it be implemented in a timely fashion, or are protracted delays anticipated? Are project partners, including consultants and subcontractors, qualified? Will legal, regulatory, or technical obstacles impede it? Can any adverse effects be reversed or adequately mitigated? Does it enjoy public support? Is it compatible with other programs and projects, which are part of an integrated restoration program for the waterway? Does it have synergistic effects with ongoing programs?

The project uses existing technology and the design has received outside engineering review. Assuming no serious delays in environmental documentation, the project can be implemented in a timely fashion. The proposal notes that several sensitive plant and animal species live in the area and that final design will be completed in coordination with appropriate state and federal resource and include necessary measures to avoid or reduce impacts.

The project partners appear qualified and have incorporated substantial interaction with local landowners (including the Army Corps of Engineers, which owns the land where the proposed project will be installed) and groups as well as state and federal agencies. The project has broad public support and has been endorsed by the Biological Technical Team of the Yuba River Fisheries Technical Working Group.

4. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

The budget is reasonable and several partners have agreed to substantial cost sharing commitments.

5. **Partnerships/Opportunities.** Does the project fully involve appropriate partners? Are the applicants willing participants? Are other cost-sharing funds available, and fully exploited?

The project has extensive involvement by many local entities and all of the appropriate state and federal agencies.

6. **Regional Review.** How did the regional panel(s) rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)? Did the regional panel(s) identify significant benefits (regional priorities, linkages with other activities, local involvement) or impediments (local constraints, conflicts with other activities, lack of local involvement) to this proposal? What were they?

Medium. The regional review was not explicit in explaining this rating but noted that the project was adequately linked and that participants of this project were also involved in other restoration efforts on the Yuba River. One panel member questioned whether this project, which apparently was required under SWRCB D1644, should be funded by CALFED.

7. **Administrative Review.** Were there significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews? What were they?

No

Miscellaneous comments:

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 260

Applicant Organization: Yuba County Water Agency

Proposal Title: Yuba Goldfields Fish Barrier Replacement Project

Overall Ranking: -Low **XMedium** -High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

This is the next phase to a project that began in 1999. Parties to the project had issues to work out and are now ready to move forward.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

The project is technically feasible and includes all interested parties.

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

XYes -No

How?

The project addresses PSP priority SR-2 habitat improvement and SR-6, fish barrier to improve spring and fall-run populations

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

XYes -No

How?

This project is adequately linked. The participants of this project are all involved in other restoration efforts on the Yuba.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

XYes -No

How?

All the local entities and agencies have worked together on this.

Other Comments:

One member of the panel questioned whether this is something CALFED should be funding in consideration of SWRCB Decision 1644.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding:

New Proposal Number: 260

New Proposal Title: Yuba Goldfields Fish Barrier Replacement Project

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

ERP 98-N03 - Life History and Stock Composition of Steelhead

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

N/A

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

-Yes XNo -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

Steelhead Trapping by Jones Stokes & Associates is indefinitely halted due to Endangered Species permitting delays.

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

The work is being subcontracted to Jones & Stokes Associates. Yuba County Water Agency has not been heavily involved in project management.

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 260

Applicant Organization: Yuba County Water Agency

Proposal Title: Yuba Goldfields Fish Barrier Replacement Project

1. Are the legal or regulatory issues that affect the proposal identified adequately in the proposal?

-Yes ☒No

If no, please explain:

Project may need a grading permit and a State Lands Commission lease, depending on the actual construction methods used.

2. Does the project's timeline and budget reflect adequate planning to address legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

3. Do the legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal significantly impair the project's feasibility?

-Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

If all necessary permits are obtained, this project is feasible.

Other Comments:

Budget:**Proposal Number:** 260**Applicant Organization:** Yuba County Water Agency**Proposal Title:** Yuba Goldfields Fish Barrier Replacement Project

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

2. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

3. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

5. Do the total funds requested (Form I, Question 17A) equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary?

☐Yes ☒No

If no, please explain (for example, are costs to be reimbursed by cost share funds included in the budget summary).

difference of 35,687. It is stated in the proposal on page 16 Calfed's share is 100,834.

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

-Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: